## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Victor Teresa-Molina,

No. CV-19-02154-PHX-DJH

10 Petitioner,

**ORDER** 

11 || \

Frank Strada, et al.,

Respondents.

Pending before the Court is Petitioner's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 5) to which Respondents filed a Limited Answer (Doc. 11). Following a thorough and comprehensive analysis, Magistrate Judge Burns recommended denial of and dismissal with prejudice of the Petition. (Doc. 12).

Judge Burns advised the parties that they had fourteen days to file objections and that the failure to timely do so "may result in the acceptance of the Report and Recommendation by the district court without further review. (Doc. 12 at 8) (citing *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*)). Petitioner has not filed an objection and the time to do so has expired. Respondents have also not filed an objection. Absent any objections, the Court is not required to review the findings and recommendations in the R&R. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1989) (noting that the relevant provision of the Federal Magistrates Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), "does not on its face require any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection."); *Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d at 1121 (same); Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b)(3) ("The district

1

judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to.").

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed Judge Burns's comprehensive and wellreasoned R&R and agrees with its findings and recommendations. The Court will, therefore, accept the R&R and dismiss the Petition. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge."); Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b)(3) (same).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Burns's R&R (Doc. 12) is accepted and adopted as the order of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 5) is **denied** and **dismissed with prejudice**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, a Certificate of Appealability and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal are **denied** because dismissal of the Petition is justified by a plain procedural bar and jurists of reason would not find the procedural ruling debatable.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall terminate this action and enter judgment accordingly.

Dated this 14th day of January, 2020.

Honorable Diane J. Humetewa United States District Judge